LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

BM
560
.S5

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
Chap. BM58d
Shelf .S5
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

THE MISSIONARY

SCAPE-GOAT,

EMPLOYED BY

Brutal Convert-Hunting Nimrods,

RIDING ON A

BEASTLY CROWING ROOSTER

COPYRIGHT
Feb 8
1854

BY JOSEPH SIMPSON,

A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES,

THE HEBREW CONFESSION.

PRINTED BY HANZSCHE & BRO., 212 BALTIMORE STREET.

BM580
.S5

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1853,
By JOSEPH SIMPSON,
In the Clerk's Office, of the District Court of the United States, in and for the State of Maryland.

KIND READER!

In submitting my honest thoughts to your consideration, permit me to assure you, that I am not inconsistent enough, as a Citizen of the United States, to stoop to notice a strolling Missionary poulterer, and neither am I so conceited to presume, that my Hebrew brethren, particularly as a class of American Citizens, are in need that an humble individual, such as I am, should defend and protect them; but as a fellow citizen of yours, prompted by a sense of duty, I most respectfully call your attention to a subject, which I honestly conceive to require attention.

THE AUTHOR.

The Missionary Scape Goat.

The following advertisement appeared on the very tip-top of the first column of the "Baltimore Clipper," on Tuesday, the 11th of October last, (the day preceding the Hebrew religious day of Atonement,) entitled: "the Jewish Ceremonies of to-day!" communicated to said paper, by some obscure scribbler, who did not sign his name, to enable the generous American public to have the pleasure of expressing their thanks to their great benefactor. He merely exhibits that the bottom of his private concern is marked L. C. N.

A TRUE COPY.

For the Baltimore Clipper.—The Jewish Ceremonies of to-day.

"Messrs. Editors:—Knowing that many readers of the Clipper will be pleased to get some general information concerning the day of Atonement, commonly called *Yom Kippur*, I beg to supply for their perusal a short sketch of its celebration.

"The fast of Expiation is the most solemn day of the Jewish year. The pious as well as those who during the whole year care but little for religion, all, all look upon the advent of that day with uncommon feelings of awe and veneration, all business operations are suspended; even those who never close their stores on any of the feasts and fasts, shut them up on that day. The Jews believe it to be the great assize day in Heaven; the need of *actual atonement* is most keenly felt, and in consequence of which a custom arose among the widely scattered tribes, to bring some kind of sacrifice on the day preceding the day of atonement. Each male member of a pious family takes a cock, and a female a hen, repeating the 10th, 14th, 17th and 21st verses CVII Psalm, and 23d and 24th verses of the XXXIII of Job, adding at the commencement the words "children of men," after having repeated this formula, he moveth the bird three times round his head, saying: "may this be my atonement, may this be my substitute, may this be my commutation, this (here follow the various alterations; if the atonement is made for a male member, the words are this cock—for a female this hen,) goeth to death, that I may be gathered and enter into a long and happy life, and into peace."

"I do not pretend to give a correct description of all the ceremonies, for this will be beyond the limits of one article, nor must I be understood either to endorse or attack the ceremonies, I simply state the facts for the information of your numerous readers.

"On the same day the atonement is made, every pious Jew goeth (about noon) to the Synagogue and receives, of his own accord, forty stripes save one.

"The actual fast commences this year, Thursday evening, October 11th, about five o'clock, and lasts until Wednesday, when the starlight can be discerned with the naked eye. The whole time is spent in prayers, without partaking of any nourishment whatever. Not one single drop of cold water is allowed. All the married male worshippers are dressed in snow white garments, in their burial dress, given to them as a present by their faithful spouses on the marriage-day.

"The next striking (to a stranger) features of their services are the plaintive chant; they chant all their prayers. Together with repeated strokes upon their breasts, like the publican of old. "Have mercy upon me, a miserable sinner." Every worshipper gives himself no less than six hundred and fourteen strokes. This estimate is rather below the real number, and doth not include the thirty-nine stripes.

"I regret that I cannot enter more fully into the character of their religious services, they are unparalled in beauty and pathos, and some of their prayers descriptive of their captive state and longing for deliverance, are most plaintive and affecting.

"The Synagogues are open from Tuesday until Wednesday evening. Every one who behaves himself with decorum, is permitted to enter and witness the services. The ladies must go up to the galleries, the gentlemen to the body of the Synagogue; to those who desire to visit it, I should recommend half-past five o'clock, Tuesday evening, and between one, two and four o'clock, Wednesday evening.

L. C. N."

This is now the grand and magnificent job, highly finished and masterly accomplished, by this extra superfine great expounder of Hebrew national religious ideas, and the motives and intentions of their religious forms and ceremonies; and all this toilsome work he performed purely to delight and enlighten the numerous readers of the "Baltimore Clipper," because he has decided that they must be pleased with its perusal.

Let us now examine the contents of this most delicious dish, so gracefully presented by this most refined master of ceremonies.

L. C. N. in addressing himself to the editors of the "Clipper," commences his epistle, saying: "*Knowing* that many readers of the Clipper will be *pleased* to get some general information, concerning the day of atonement, commonly called '*Yom Kippur*,' I beg to supply for their perusal a short sketch of its celebration."

Pray, by what means has he discovered that many readers of the Clipper will be pleased to receive information, and from him? And supposing even that some of our Christian fellow citizens should wish to be informed, can they not find amongst their fellow citizens Jews enough to be informed by them? Are the Jews such obscure people, or quite a new started sect? Do they close the doors of their Synagogues or private dwellings, not to permit Christians to visit them? Are they so unsocial that Christians cannot visit them? To be sure, the Jew

prudently declines to converse with such unmannerly fellows, who are vulgar enough to violate the just rules of social decency, and who are so rude to tell him to his face that there is no salvation to his soul, because he is a Jew! In plain words: "That he must go to h—l." Those, who desire that the Jew should please them in this line, ought at least to be sufficiently polite to add to it, "if you please," because there is no compulsion in the case. But in a friendly social manner the Jew will cheerfully converse with the Christian, or any one else, without any reserve, and where he differs, he differs honestly without impeaching the intelligence and virtue of those he differs with; and therefore if some of our Christian friends wish to be informed, they can quite easily find their Hebrew fellow-citizens to render them this most important service, and there is no need for any foreign emissary, or some strolling idler who makes a vulgar trade of it, to meddle with it.

Let us now investigate the bottomless depth of the extraordinary scholarship of this unnatural genius! After making some unimportant flounces, he proceeds and in a most profound sonorous voice emphatically bursts out and exclaims: "the Jews believe it to be the great assize day in Heaven, the need of an *actual atonement* is keenly felt, and *in consequence of which a custom arose* among the widely scattered tribes, to bring some kind of *sacrifice* on the day preceding the day of atonement."

Now permit me candidly to remark, that this statement of his is playing the grossest deception on the Christian mind, in attempting to make them believe that the Jew keenly feels the *need of Sacrifice for actual atonement.*

We must bear in mind, that sacrifice is made *local* by *law*, Lev. ch. 17, v. 4, 5, 7, namely, only at the national sanctuary, where sacrifices can be offered, but nowhere else, and the law also specifies what is admissible as a sacrifice. The very fact that the law makes it *local*, must prove to any reflecting mind, that it is not needed for actual atonement. To ascertain the true motive and intention of the institution of sacrifice, can only be done by ascertaining the surrounding circumstances which have called it into existence. One thing we see quite explicitly by the law itself, namely, that it is intended to operate upon the mind as a negative against the mistakes and errors of those who surrounded them; and being

called in existence by circumstances, it must be subject to circumstances also; but not that it is needed for actual atonement, and any intelligent being who reads the old Testament, will find it repeated over and over again that sacrifice is not required for actual atonement.

Let us now take into consideration how L. C. N. as a most accomplished astrological state-moral-economist, succeeds with his laborious job.

In his violent rage for sacrifice he sacrifices every particle of common sense, and up he jumps and saddles the cock, as he quite politely calls it, and mounts his hen-story, alleging that it is religiously intended by the Jew as a sacrifice for actual atonement. It seems that L. C. N. feels his own high importance and acts the part of Chief Judge of the Supreme Court of the Hebrew Nation, and boldly decides that each member of a *pious* family takes a cock, &c., only because his honor the Chief Judge maintains the Jew cannot possibly be *pious* without the use of such instrument.

Let us consider whether the Jew can be guilty of misusing the poor chicken for such a purpose. Firstly, he would violate the law which makes sacrifice local; secondly, he would violate the law which specifies the animals admissible as sacrifice; excluding those not mentioned, and Moses does not say a single word about cock and hen; thirdly, if the Jew should intend it as a sacrifice for actual atonement, he ought to do it on the day of atonement, and not on the day preceding it; and lastly, what shall the poor man do who unfortunately has not the means to procure a rooster for himself and a hen for his poor wife? What! shall these poor folks actually run about all their life-time with their heavy burden of sin, and never be able to get rid of it? How monstrous!

But what is the actual fact? The day preceding the fast is observed as a feast, surely not for the purpose of being a glutton, but for the sake of the poor who might not have the means to procure a proper meal, to be able to observe the fast without hurting themselves, or to breakfast after they observe it. For this noble purpose it is truly intended, and the Jew, justly guided by his national moral sense of duty, lending his brotherly hand to his needy fellow-man, particularly when the poor as well as the rich approach the Supreme with a national religious sentiment. Under such circumstances he is particularly careful, not to do it in a mean, scanty man-

ner, but provides the best he is able to procure, and decently tenders it to his needy friend.

In consequence of this a custom arose, (in some parts and by some,) to procure poultry to feast the poor and needy with, but not, as the obscure scribbler presumes to represent, as a sacrifice for actual atonement. It is a fact that it is a general custom among the Jews, to take proper care of the poor, *but it is false* that cock and hen is a general custom. Any one who knows any thing about Hebrew learned authorities will soon find, that some decidedly *prohibit* this custom, apprehending that some might be guilty of the gross error to misconstrue it as a sacrifice for atonement, which would actually be a violation of law and national principle on different points, and those authorities who permit this custom, because apprehending, by prohibiting it, some of the poor might suffer, only permit it, providing that either the bird or at least its full value, is actually given to the poor.

But it appears that this most learned poulterer has procured all his Hebrew learning from his grand mamma's old prayer book, and which she, poor old creature, has borrowed from her one-eyed step-mother-in-law, and there he made the grand discovery that a printer has actually printed, and his granny he remembers has actually turned the chicken around her noddle, and actually exclaimed, may this be my atonement, &c., and therefore he assumes to prove by this powerful evidence, and quite conclusively, that the poor chick must necessarily be a sacrifice for actual atonement.

I beg leave most respectfully to differ with this most learned poultry judge, and am firmly of opinion, that even the most intelligent Jew, true to his national principle, if he chooses to observe said custom, can safely use these words without contradicting himself, because it is not intended that this bird, but the charitable act to be performed by giving it to the poor, shall have anything to do with the day of atonement.

But it seems that this most profound rooster-scholar is so strongly attached to the cock, that he cannot forsake the poor thing, and is determined to ride on the cock to Eternity!

The learned equestrian concludes his cock and hen story, by reading further in his grand-dame's old prayer book, and falsifies it by adding to it his absurd comment: "If the *atonement* is made for a male member, the

words are, this cock, if for a female, this hen, goeth to death, but may I be gathered and enter into a long and happy life and into peace."

The most profound scholar of a jockey presumes to have won the race, and his swift-winged rooster must conclusively be the most acceptable sacrifice for actual atonement.

With all due regard to the superfine judgment of this want-to-be-Judge in Israel, I feel inclined to differ, and maintain, that these words are intended for quite a different purpose, namely, at a moment of religious contemplation leading the mind to eternity, and in the mean time intending to have the life of an animal taken to be used as food, those words are justly intended to restrain the mind, and to guard it against those truly dangerous and most corrupting wild speculations of Transmigration of souls, by which visionary ideas they drag down the immortal soul of man to the level of the mere spirit of life of the brute, brutalizing their own mind by their brutal speculation. By such notions some one might be converted to a beastly crowing rooster, speculating that some silly goose or gander will lay a right big golden egg in his lap. For the purpose of guarding against such an error, those words are very properly intended for those who think proper to observe said custom, to remind them that the spirit of life of the mere brute goeth to death, but the soul of man in the image of his Maker is immortal.

But it seems that the eminent riding master of ceremonies has run himself out of breath, and settled down on some fence-post to contemplate on his own high importance. In this elevated position he condescends to be kind enough to inform the many readers of the "Baltimore Clipper," that he doeth not pretend to give a *correct* description of all the ceremonies.

Now it seems to me, as a citizen of the United States, that this chicken-rider is to be properly *corrected* before he presumes to give any information to others about the religious motives and intentions of a class of American citizens, and of which to say the least of it, he is beastly ignorant of; he assigns the reason, because it would be beyond the limits of one article.

Pray, has his ignorance of the subject he rudely meddles with any bounds or limits? And the most charming part of it is his modesty in his gravely saying, "I must

not be understood either to endorse or attack these ceremonies." Now, supposing he would endorse or attack, what then? But he maintains that he is simply stating the facts for the information of the numerous readers of said paper. And what is the actual fact, than that *he* is riding on a rooster to eternity? And although he asserted that he cannot go beyond the limits of one article, he proceeds with another fact of his own fabrication, and though the fact is that it is the day *preceding* the day of atonement, Mr. *Factotum* states, "On the *same day the atonement* is made, every *pious* Jew *goeth about noon* (you see he is very particular about the time in his information to the many readers of the "Baltimore Clipper," and they are to be careful and regulate their watches and time-pieces accordingly) to the Synagogue and receives on his own accord, (now mind, you readers of the "Baltimore Clipper") 40, say forty stripes save one." Now supposing that some *pious* Jew should express his contrition of mind in such a manner, will he dare to find fault with those who think proper not to perform it? you may depend upon it, if he should receive a stripe harder than his religious feeling expects, he will soon jump up and dispense with it, and there is no need for any one to be uneasy about it. But according to the sublime doctrine of L. C. N., as a self made Chief Judge in Israel, who maintains that the pious Jew is bound to use the cock as a sacrifice for actual atonement, the rascally cock ought to receive the stripes, and not the *pious* Jew who has already made atonement by sacrifice. But here we see explicitly the superior judgment of the economical judge! He cannot afford to have the cock scourged so hard, because he is in need to ride on him to Eternity.

The kind-hearted, most learned master of ceremonies after settling the most important business of the cock and hen, and the terrible forty stripes save *one*, proceeds: "The actual fast commences this year Tuesday, October the 11th, about five o'clock, and lasts until Wednesday, when the starlight can be discerned with the *naked eye.*"

Now supposing it is cloudy, they have to wait until the sky becomes clear before they can breakfast. Poor fellows!

The astronomical, most learned manufacturer of facts, after gazing at the stars and making the grand discovery, that the Jews did not partake even of a single drop of cold water, in the kindness of his so called heart, which

to some may appear to overflow with milk and honey, proceeds to inform the many readers of the "Baltimore Clipper," that all the married male worshippers are dressed in snow-white garments—in their burial dress—given to them as a present by their faithful spouses on the marriage-day.

We must take notice that the most learned dressmaker is very particular here, and undoubtedly intentionally omits the word *pious*, because it is the married Jew as a good husband showing his respect to his faithful spouse. But we must now take into consideration in what a dilemma poor *Solomon* must have been on the day of atonement with his thousand wives, each of them on the marriage day presenting him such a dress, and he, as a good husband, undoubtedly showed his respect to each and every one of them, and naturally put on all those dresses to please them all.

Let us now reflect what a charming figure the wise Solomon must have made on the day of atonement! But we must not blame L. C. N. for feeling the need of a burial dress for atonement; we must bear in mind that he is riding on the cock to Eternity.

But now comes the hardest fact of all facts, manufactured by the most refined and most accomplished master of ceremonies for the information of the numerous readers of the "Baltimore Clipper." He states: "The next striking (to a stranger) features of their services are the plaintive chants; they chant all their prayers, together with the repeated strokes upon their breast (and he adds to it his vulgar comment) like the Publican of old, have mercy upon me a miserable sinner.

Let us seriously take into consideration, religious forms and ceremonies, as tokens of expression of religious sentiment, of joy or sorrow, gladness or grief, where no nation or community can dictate to another what forms as means should be adopted to express sentiments by, and the Jews, like more civilized nations, having adopted the form as a token of sincerity, by laying the hand on the heart, he vulgarly styles it strokes. Not satisfied with this, he malignantly stigmatizes the Jew in his religious sincerity, that he does it like the publican of old, who hypocritically used this national token of sincerity for the purpose of deception, and the modern publican, like the old, bawls out, "Have mercy upon me a miserable sinner!" He concludes his buffonian orgies by

showing that, according to his old grand-dame's old prayer-book, the Jew gives himself no less than 614, say six hundred and fourteen strokes, and this estimate is rather below the real number and doeth not include the forty save one stripes, which altogether, according to his own doctrine, the cock as a sacrifice for atonement, ought to have received, but we see already that he is in need to ride on him to Eternity.

The most accomplished clown proceeds to inform the numerous readers of the "Baltimore Clipper," that he regrets not to be able to enter more fully in his job, and gives himself the appearance of a Hebrew Scholar, but if you examine him you will find that he is ignorant of the Hebrew Alphabet, which is my firm opinion.

And to crown it all, this two-legged animal gives a full specimen of his politeness and social decency, he has the brazen-faced impudence to give public notice and issue a kind of public invitation, to come and witness a curious scene, designating the particular time when the most curious part, as he conceives, is to be seen, and it seems to me, that he has learned his manners in a chicken-coop, and some of its contents are sticking on him, and every step he takes shows its marks.

Let us take into consideration a community composed of American citizens, holding a religious meeting to serve their Maker, as their conscience dictates, which is fully protected and secured by the noble institutions of our glorious Republican Union, and preserved and maintained by the sovereign free will of the citizens of the United States. The meeting held on their private premises, the community as a body incorporated and chartered by the sovereign state as property holders, the jurisdiction of it within its limits belonging exclusively to them, if the doors should be opened and at what time they should be opened, they, exclusively and none else are the judges of it. To give public notice and issue public invitations, can only be done by their authorities and by none other. True, the Jews never close their doors to prevent their fellow-citizens from visiting them, and are always glad to see them, but it is by their own free will, and not by compulsion. Now supposing after the giving of public notice and the issuing of public invitation, like the one of the obscure scribler, the Jews, as a class of American citizens would think proper to have the doors of their synagogues closed at the time he

designates, or even for the whole day, will *he* or *anybody* else dare to order them to open them? Or did he intend to excite curiosity, to create a mob, to force the doors open by violence? Let him put his nose to the ground he is treading upon, and smell that it is the ground of the United States of America.

We see how attentive he is to our Christian fellow-citizens, that they should not get into trouble; he tells them, every one who behaves with decorum is permitted to enter and witness the services. And why does he give them this information? Plainly, because he considers our Christian fellow-citizens so beastly stupid, that they would not know it, if he would not have informed them of it.

But now comes the most delicious part of his enchanting acts. The heroic cock-rider takes the Christian ladies up stairs and places them in the galleries, and orders the gentlemen down in the body of the Synagogue. As for the Jews, he seems to maintain that they have nothing to say to it, because he is the mounted cock-riding master of ceremonies to Eternity.

Now, my dear fellow-citizens, that a strolling Missionary poulterer acts vagrant-like, there is nothing surprising in it, because we must bear in mind, that it is the nature of the beast to act beastly, and that we cannot expect of a hog more than a grunt. The Jews as a class of American citizens, in justice to themselves and justly respecting the honorable station they are occupying among their fellow-citizens, will treat his conduct as it deserves, namely, with the most profound contempt. But the question is, has he no confederates, who, as our fellow-citizens, are aiding and abetting, nourishing and prompting him in his wild gambols. Would *he*, who is a *stranger*, and who, as I am credibly informed, is *not a citizen*, could he have dared to offer to a class of American citizens at the very time of their religious devotions such beastly vulgar preparation of his, if some, who are at least to know better, would not have countenanced and encouraged him? We know that there is a regular organized herd of convert-hunters constantly at work at their trade. Is it not actually remarkable, that at any time there is a strong political excitement amongst us about political questions, a certain kind of animals belonging to the Missionary traders, as foreign agents, are sure to make their public appearance amongst us, and

are trying some way or another to meddle with public opinion?

We must take notice that this publication is on the 11th of October, at the time of the highest political excitement amongst us in reference to the late election.—Who are those countenancing and aiding this charming scribbler? Some of the self-styled Temperance and open Bible men!

Now in regard to Temperance. I ask those cold water head folks, whether they will deny that the Jews are a sober people?

Those watery Philosophers assert that the tavern is the cause of intemperance, are the taverns not as accessible for the Jew as it is for the Christian? Then according to the confession of those Philosophers, intemperance is peculiarly a Christian disease. The question is what is the true cause? Are the Jews made of different materials or are they created by another God than Christians are? What is the reason then that the Jew (according to the *confession* of those amphibolous philosophers,) is at least better capable to restrain his mind and retain his capacity of self-government, then those who are under their care and tutorage. But what is the real cause? It is that the Jew has the day of Atonement which by the self-preserving spirit it contains, duly impresses upon his mind the restraint necessary for self-government; not merely for the moment, and not merely for the day, but for all the year round and for all his life time.

To understand this, they must not go to some stupid pustule crammed with cock and hen, stripes and strokes, burial dress, &c., and the masterly piece of horsemanship in riding on the cock to Eternity. With such and those like him I have no dealings; they must first go and take the trouble to learn social manners and social decency, to enable themselves to understand any thing reasonable and just. At present we see that they are absorbed in their missionary trade speculation, but you, dear reader, whether Jew or Christian, as my American fellow-citizens whom I know fully well that they actually love Truth and practice Justice, and that they worthy of themselves, will not despise Truth and Justice, even if it comes from such an humble source as me, to you I most respectfully bow, and beg leave to call your attention to my remarks, not for my sake but for the sake of Justice and Truth.

To ascertain the motives and intentions of national ideas of a people like the Jews, a nation the most ancient, a people by their institutions and laws the most remarkable, and who cannot be seperated historically from the history of the human race and the progress of civilization; to understand their motives and intentions, we must study the Ancient Jews as a nation on their own ground and on their own premises, according to their own institutions and laws, and according to their peculiar conception of social organization and its preservation; and only then and not before can we presume to come to any just conclusion about it, and be able to draw some lessons for our own instruction, whether Jew or Christian, as fellow-citizens together in our present age, and under our present circumstances.

This is the very case with the day of Atonement. We must enquire: how did the ancient Jews spend this day before they had houses of prayer, and not even any set of prayers? We must not lose sight that the Tabernacle and not even the Temple can be considered as houses of prayer, and the law did not require on the day of atonement that the people should appear at the national sanctuary as on some of the other annual festivals. Now is the question, how did they spend the day? In what did they engage themselves on this religiously serious national day? Yes they did engage themselves on this serious and solemn day in a subject truly serious and solemn, to be practised the whole year round; namely the means to be used how to promote social welfare and happiness by social virtue, and securing the foundation of social virtue by the safety of female virtue, and to accomplish all this by quite natural means; namely: by the preventative system, in not exposing to danger the daughter even of the poorest of the poor by the neglect of society. They could not judiciously select a better day for this solemn purpose than the day of Atonement and such like. Peculiarly the day of Atonement being a solemn religious fast day, the passions curbed, the mind serene, to take calmly into consideration how to accomplish this truly grand social object, practically to be carried out by every opportunity. It is my firm opinion that if honest temperance men who are sincere in their intentions, would study this, they would soon be able to discover the real source of intemperance, and this discovery would enable them to adopt means accordingly for its remedy.

As for the Jews, as long as they are Jews, they will remain a reflecting, sober people, and be able to take care of themselves; they go by the Bible, but will take good care not to run crazy by it. The Bible tells historically about drunkards and drunkenness, and shows the cause, and the remedy also. The first drunkard on record is old Noah, and the cause we see is, because he drank the wine all himself and did not give a single drop to any one else, and the Bible teaches us to drink wine, but socially, and none will get too much.

The next on record is, old *Lot;* the cause: his wife being salty he became thirsty, and the worst of all, he had two grown-up marriageable daughters, and he neglected decently to provide them with husbands, the girls became desperate, and in their desperation made a beast of their father. This teaches us to take proper care of the girls, and provide them decently with husbands, and drink wine on their wedding day. And Christians must not forget that about 1820 years ago a certain Jew whom they cannot deny to be respectable, at a certain wedding, wine running short, he himself furnished them with it, and I am quite sure that he acted honestly, and did not mix even a single drop of cold or warm water in it. He actually furnished them with real good wine.

The Jew understands the law, Lev. ch. X., v. 9. 10. 11. that it is intended to guard against the worst kind of intemperance, namely religious intemperance. On the other hand the Jew finds Gen. ch. 14.. v. 18.: "And Melchizedek King of Salem brought forth bread and wine, and he was the priest of the most high God." Psalm. ch. 104. v. 15, "And wine that maketh glad the heart of man." Prov. ch. 31., v. 6. 7, "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts, let him drink, and forget his poverty and remember his misery no more." Reflecting on all this the Jew restrains his mind and remains capable of self-government, and let the true friend of temperance do the same, and he will surely accomplish his just intention.

In regard to the open Bible question, let it be open for investigation and let us examine whether this book will be useful or hurtful to the minds of our youths when introduced in the Public Schools for their consideration, and this is the question? Before I proceed with my remarks, permit me to assure you in truth and candour, that my mind is entirely pure from any kind of prejudice

against the creed and confession of any class of my fellow-men, and I would be sorry indeed to permit my mind to conceive the barbarous thought, of impeaching the intelligence and virtue of any one of my fellow-men, for the sake of his religious views, by which he conceives proper to make himself agreeable to his Maker, as long as he permits others to do the same according to their views guided by the same restriction, in letting others alone, because in matters between man and his Maker we must leave it to the man and his Maker, and the man can and must use his own means, and has no demand on others.

Not so with such a most serious social affair between man and man, as the Public Schools, which is exclusively for the cultivation of the mind of our youths, to learn to know their rights and their duties as members of society toward one another, and the means to accomplish it. We must, also, in reference to the means to be employed in the Public Schools for the cultivation of the mind of our youths, be guided by the same principle, and naturally every member of society has a right, and it is his duty, to show cause, if any, why he objects to some of the means employed there for this social object. And if it should so happen that there is a difference of opinion whether the objection is right or not, naturally majority decides. Majority can only be justly admissible on the principle of fellow-citizenship, but not artificial or accidental majority by creed or confession, because in this case before us we can only meet as fellow-citizens, and in no other way. The reason must be obvious to every reflecting mind, because so soon we would permit majorities by creed and confession to decide general social concerns, we will soon have to submit to creed and confession to decide *all* our social concerns.

Let us now examine the open Bible, whether it will be useful or hurtful to the mind of our youths when used in our Public Schools for the general social purpose intended.

In investigating the Bible as a book to be used in our Public Schools for the general social purpose, and every one to be taxed for its support, as a public institution, we must confine ourselves to the historical accounts the book contains, and examine, whether they are historically true or not. With the different constructions of the Bible by the different creeds, as regards creed, we have

nothing to do with, this we are bound to leave to those who are concerned in the creed as their private concern, provided they are not guilty of introducing their private concern in the public Schools, which are decidedly a general social concern, and every one is justly taxed for its support as a publiic concern, and creed majorities are no majorities in this case. But even admitting that this is well provided for, to make the social concern safe and secure against the intrusion of private concern of creed, we have still to examine the Bible, whether or not it will serve the social purpose, and for which purpose only every member of society can justly be taxed for its support.

We are quite aware that the cultivation of the mind of our youths, in regard to their rights and their duties as social duties, cannot be accomplished without a true sense of moral duty, but the very sense of social moral duty is quite independent of creed and confession, and therefore in using the Bible in our Public Schools for the moral instruction of their minds, we can only use it historically as lessons for moral instruction, and are bound to avoid all the different constructions of creed, seeing as we do already, that the creeds differ with one another in the construction of the same.

But in introducing the Bible in our Public Schools for moral instruction by historical lessons, we must be very careful how we introduce it; because we must bear in mind that history is a very stubborn concern: it is by its very nature either historically true or not; we must therefore take particular care that the youth should have no reason for suspecting the historical truth of the Bible; because as soon as he should find ground for such suspicion, the book represented to him as historical truth, instead of impressing upon his mind by its historical lessons the sense of moral duty, will be reversed, and demoralize and corrupt him. True, we can derive lessons for moral instruction even from mere fiction, but provided it is represented as such; but historical lesson must be historical fact.

And we must not forget that our American youths, those Yankee bohoys, are just like the children of Israel, true, sometimes a little childish, but what of all this? As soon as it comes to anything manly, they, you may depend upon it, will show their manliness, and will not submit to any presumptious dictations. With good

sense and reason divine, they are approachable; by the moral sense of right and duty, they can be guided to the highest moral perfection.

Let us now examine the open Bible to be used in the Public Schools, where every one is taxed for its support, and every one entitled to its benefit of moral instruction of his children, whether there are not historical accounts in it, which the youth cannot reasonably admit to be historical fact, at least as construed by creed.

As long as the Bible is used by any *class* of our fellow-citizens, organized by creed agreeable to them, they exclusively are responsible, and we are bound to repose full confidence in them as our fellow-citizens, that they will take care, that society should have no social reason of complaint. Not so when the Bible is introduced in our Public Schools, where the restraint of creed is in a great measure restrained. The public is responsible for the result, and where, if any, differences of opinion should occur, accidental majority of creed cannot be admissible to decide it, because each creed is surely sovereign and independent. In such a case, majority can only be admissible by the principle of confederation of sovereignities, where all are equally represented, as the Union of our Sovereign States. Religious creed being a natural, reserved right, it must, by its very nature, be sovereign and independent, as nature itself, which is surely sovereign, responsible exclusively to its elevated Author.

Before I proceed to call your attention to historical accounts in the Bible of such description as I am alluding to, permit me solemnly to assure you, that it is not my intention to stigmatize the Bible, and though I may appear to some very severe and sarcastic in the course of my remarks, be assured that it is only intended by me as an illustration, how the lively imagination of the youth will go to work with it, if we do not take proper care in which manner it is introduced to him for his consideration in the Public School, where we cannot permit that Clergymen of any creed should control his sense and reason.

I will now begin with the first chapter of Matthew in connexion with the old Testament, where the historical account given in Matthew, part of it is historically given in the old Testament also, and show, that the youth in the Public School, will not take it as an historical fact, at least in the manner as it is introduced to him.

The author of the book of Matthew gives us a historical

account, the generations of Jesus. He commences: Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob, &c., until Joseph; after he has done with this, he shows us something very strange and very remarkable. He maintains that there are fourteen generations from Abraham to David, and fourteen generations from David to Jechonias, whom said author alleges to be the son of Josias, and fourteen generations from the carrying away into Babylon to Jesus. Now the generations from Abraham to Jechonias are historically given in the old Testament, where their acts as historical characters, and the computation of time connected with those historical transactions, are also given.

We have now the open Bible in the hands of our youths in the Public Schools; they will naturally examine first, whether the full historical statement in the old Testament agrees with the statement in the new, and then they will investigate, whether the statement in the the old Testament itself can reasonably be taken literally as historical fact. The author of the book of Matthew presumes to tell us, that there are only fourteen generations from David to Jechonias, and the old Testament, giving us the full historical account, states positively that there are *eighteen* generations, giving the account of the historical acts of each, and the computation of time. In Matthew it is said, Joram begat Ozias, and in the old Testament we find Joram begat Ahaziah. Ahaziah begat Joash, Joash begat Amaziah, and Amaziah begat Ozias. From the commencement of the reign of Ahaziah until the commencement of Ozias' are not less than seventy seven years. Now here we have (I mean our youths in the Public Schools) three kings as historical characters, and seventy seven years of historical time denied existence by the author of the book of Matthew. What will we, I mean our youth, find more? Nothing less than that from the death of Joram until the birth of Ozias is sixty one years. Will our youth agree to it that a fellow in his grave already sixty one years, should presume to do such a thing? I actually believe that our youths, whether Jew or Christian, know better. The American youth, as a smart little fellow, and smart they are! will consider again that Ozias, like all decent folks, undoubtedly had a mother, and he will soon find in the old Testament, that her name was Jecholiah, a highly respectable lady! Will the youth not seriously take into considera-

tion, whether it is creditable for any decent woman to have any dealings with a fellow in his grave sixty-one years already? and must we not expect that our noble American youth, as a good republican, will justly exclaim: "*What?* Have these monarchial fellows not fun enough in their lifetime, that they cannot rest even in the grave?"

Our American youth reading the old Testament, 2d Chron., ch. 21., v. 20, will find, that *Joram* was forty years old when he died, and in the next chapter, v. 2, he will find that his son Ahaziah was forty-two years old at the death of his father, but he will find 2nd Kings, ch. 8. v. 26, where it is corrected by saying 22 years instead of 42; but the correction of the generations in Luke, ch. 3, makes it worse still; because there the youth will find, that from Joseph up to David they are quite different customers, than those in Matthew, and I am sure, that our American youth will justly maintain, that one set of generation is quite enough for any decent man.

Our youth will discover more in Matthew. It is asserted that *Josias* begat *Jechonias*, and in the historical account in the old Testament it is positively stated that it is not *Josias* but Jehoakim his son, who bebegat Jechonias. Will our youth admit that it is historically true, that Jehoakim permitted his father to meddle with it, or to charge such a good man as *Josias*, with such a disgusting act? In the old Testament, in Kings and Chron. he will find that Jehoiakim was 25 years of age when he commenced his reign, and reigned 11 years. His son, *Jechonias*, according to Kings, was 18 years old when he commenced to reign, and reigned 3 months; in Chron. that he was 8 years old when he commenced to reign, and reigned 3 months and 10 days. It is reasonable to suppose that Chron. is right, that Jechonias was a mere boy, because in Kings we see plainly, that he is led by his mother to the king of Babylon; and still the author of the book of Matthew makes such great fuss about the mere boy who reigned to the utmost 3 months and 10 days, and denies the very existence of his father, Jehoiakim who was a man of 25 years of age, when he commenced to reign, and reigned 11 years!

Now even admitting that our American youths in the Public Schools, being as they actually are good natured

will try to find some excuse for the author of the book of Matthew, for his omission, because they will consider that there is a young widow in the case, the mother of Jechonias present: and the author of the book of Matthew, out of pure politeness to the lady, does not mention anything about her late husband; still must we bear in mind that our noble American youths are for strict honesty to the public; will they countenance that any one should attempt, even for the sake of the best looking lady, to pilfer the public, particularly our intelligent American public! and rob them of one of the most important historical characters, and of eleven years of historical time? Indeed, I have a better opinion of our brave youths, and harbor not the least suspicion against their integrity and honor toward our public, and I am firmly of opinion tnat they will not countenance anything unfair or unjust.

Let us now take into consideration whether our youths in the Public Schools will admit that the acccunt in the old testament of the fourteen generations from Abraham to David, should be taken literally as historical fact. They will have the open Bible and will naturally find therein: Naasson begat Salmon, Salmon begat Booz, Booz begat Obed, Obed begat Jesse, and Jesse begat David. Our youths will then take into consideration the computation of time; he will then find that from the going out of Egypt until the death of David are 476 years, because 1. Kings, ch. 6. v. 1. states, that the fourth year of the reign of Solomon was 480, from the coming out of Egypt. Naasson, our youth will see in the books of Moses, died in the wildnerness; admitting that our youth will give Naasson the benefit of all the forty years, and at the last moment he begat Salmon, will remain for Salmon, Booz, Obed, Jesse and David 436 years. Our youth will notice again, 1st Sam. ch. 22, v. 3., that Jesse was among the living, when his son David, according to the Bible, must have been about 28 years of age. The youth in the Public School will take his slate and deduct the remaining 42 years of David from 436, there will remain 394, and this sum our youth will honestly divide between Salmon, Booz, Obed and Jesse, and each of those gentlemen will receive 98½ years; and seeing, as he will, in the Bible, that Jesse did not conceive it to be his duty to close his eyes and die as soon as he begat his son David; our youth will quite naturally come to the

conclusion, that the other three gentlemen, Salmon, Booz and Obed have been of the same opinion, and I actually think that our youth will not be quite mistaken in it, because there is no need for moral instruction to take it literally as historical fact, that there have not been more generations than those named.

We see now, kind reader, the great difficulty we have to contend with, to reconcile historical accounts in the old Testament by itself. But permit me now to call your attention to the New Testament, which makes it worse still. The author of the book of Matthew presumes to tell us, that Salmon begat Booz of Rachab. What will our youth in our Public School think of it? He in any reasonable way, cannot admit that Salmon was born before the crossing of the Jordan; because fair dealing requires to give to Naasson, his father, all the forty years in the wilderness. Rachab by her occupation, according to Joshua, ch. 2. v. 1., was already old enough to follow her trade; will not our youth take into consideration, whether it is reasonable to suppose that a woman, like Rachab, actually had patience to wait until Salmon was old and big enough to be her husband?—

I am quite aware, that some Hebrew writers maintain, that old General Joshua had something to do with this affair. But we must bear in mind, that a military commander-in-chief in time of war, exercising martial law, cannot be questioned about his motives and intentions; and I, as a Hebrew republican citizen soldier, will fight any man who dares to approach rudely and stigmatize the acts of my Hebrew republican citizen general. But in time of peace, under civil law, to attempt to force such young blood, such nice young gentleman as Salmon and who, by his family connections, is fully entitled to decent treatment, being the son of Naasson, the prince of the tribe of Juda; his father's sister Elisheba, a highly respectable lady, the wife of Aaron the high priest, the only brother of Moses, the high priest at the time being Eleazar the son of Aaron, being first cousin of this young gentleman Salmon: and for any one to dare to propose, that he shall take to his tender young heart old Rachab, who was at least old enough to be his mother; and considering her conduct in her younger days, will our noble youths in our Public Schools, who belong to respectable families, approve

such a match? For my own part, I decidedly oppose it, and do hereby solemnly protest against it, because I consider it as a gross insult, offered to the firm and respectable house of Israel, to introduce such a new-fashioned piece of furniture in it.

We have now the open Bible before us. Nobody can deny that there are different opinions how the Bible should be construed, and even differing, what is Bible and what is not, let us then settle first what is Bible, and then how to construe it.

Can we, dare we, submit it to the decision of any creed, or of all of them together? Are we at liberty to do so? We can only approach it purely in our capacity as fellow-citizens, and in no other way; if any difference of opinion should arise, involving the right of creeds and confessions, and majority should decide, then majority can only be admissible, according to the principle of confederation of sovereignities, because liberty of conscience being the most natural reserved right, must be as sovereign and independent as Nature itself, responsible exclusively to the most elevated Author of the Creation.

We have before us not merely the open Bible, but the open Biblemen also. Let us now inquire whether they are sincere in their pretension of open Bible. They insist upon having the open Bible in our Public Schools, where we are all taxed for its support, and before we as citizens, have decided what Bible is and how to construe it. *How* will those open Bible men have the open Bible introduced in the public schools? to be sure, as they admit it to be, Bible, and as they peculiarly construe it, and this is the whole amount, the sum total, of their discordant noise of open Bible.

Now if these open Biblemen are actually sincere, I will propose something to test their sincerity. None can deny that the liberty of conscience of the Jews, as a class of American citizens, is as sovereign and independent as the liberty of conscience of any other class, and each class is in duty bound to secure the mind of their youths in the conception of their ideas peculiar to themselves, and if they perceive that any attempt is made, to impress on the mind of their youths any idea not agreeable to the conception of the class, the class is bound, and nobody can deny them the right, to adopt means to oppose it. Now if the open Biblemen claim to have the right to in-

the Bible, as they construe it, in the Public Schools, which will naturally impress on the minds of the youth the peculiar construction of the open Biblemen, the Jews as a class of citizens, have the same right, and it is their duty also, to introduce their construction of the Bible in the Public Schools to the full extent, the preservation of their construction of the same requires. I therefore propose to the open Biblemen, that the Jews introduce their construction of the Bible in the Public Schools, and the teachers shall be bound, to explain it to the youth accordingly. But not merely the old Testament, but the new Testament with the Jews commentary, as they construe it, and nobody can deny, that the old as well as the new Testament, in the Public Schools is just as much the property of the Jews, as it is of the Christians, because we are all taxed for it. If they agree let them say so, and I will furnish them a Jewish commentary on the new Testament, to be used in our Public Schools. I will show my reasons, why certain passages therein shall be construed as I represent, and not as they do. But I like to deal fairly, and therefore tell them before hand, that they shall take care, that some Christian communities do not tell their preachers, to march down from their pulpit. And they will find out sooner than they expected, that the Jew understands the law of nature, and the nature of laws and regulations, how they operate on the mind, and he knows also how to use it.

But, kind reader, by the discordant noise of open Bible the Public Schools, the cultivation of the mind of our noble youth is lost sight of. I most solemnly appeal to you, whether it is true that we have already done all we are to do, and all we are able to do for this most important and truly grand social object—nothing less, than the cultivation of the mind of our noble youth. Yes, our noble youth, into whose hands we must at last repose for safe-keeping the noble institutions of our common country, resting on the intelligence and virtue of these who will succeed us. I repeat, have we done all we ought to do, and all we can for this most serious purpose, so that the only thing wanting is the open or close Bible. The cold Water and the open Biblemen are finding fault, that some are unfortunately unable to govern themselves, therefore these Watery philophers propose as a remedy for it Cold water and open Bible. And with all their philosophy they cannot see, that the ca-

pacity of self-government can only be attained by a proper and sufficient cultivation of the mind. Permit me then to propose something, which seems to me in my humble judgment to answer said purpose far better. We must bear in mind that the great mass of our citizens cannot send their children to Colleges and Universities, consequently the only place, where they can send their children to, are the Public Schools. Let us now consider, how long are they able to let their children go there? It is until 14, 15, the utmost 16 years of age. Now from the age, we will say 16 until 21, the very age that requires particular care to give to his mind proper strength and vigor for self-government, he is neglected! Is it any wonder that some of our youths unfortunately run into some immoderate act, and is there anything surprising, that even after 21, when he takes his station as a man, that he is used as a blind tool by some political speculator and speculating political religionist, to serve their private purpose? Why is it so? It is because the cultivation of his mind was not continued to maturity, and therefore he remains a mere child all his life time. And why was the cultivation of his mind not continued? It is not as some suppose, because his parent has to take him out to learn some trade; he has still leisure time enough to continue the cultivation of his mind. But the real cause is, because we have not yet any establishment for the general purpose according to the wants and taste of our youth at such age, namely access to scientific knowledge and its application to mechanical arts. Naturally it will require means, to establish such institutions, as the general purpose requires, and we will have to apply to our State and National Authorities, to provide for it, and the difficulty will then be not as regards the amount but on constitutional grounds. This seems to me could be avoided by giving those institutions a direct national tendency. We must take in consideration that the two arms of national defence the army and the navy, require nearly all the arts and sciences to make it what it ought to be, because war being reduced to a science, the knowledge of it, is useful and necessary for the individual for his private use, and also for his fellow citizens in private life. National safety reposed in the great mass of our fellow citizens commonly called militia, they undoubtedly are justly entitled to the knowledge of it, experience showing that in reference to numbers re-

quired for public service in time of war. Compulsatory laws not being necessary, seeing as we do that our fellow citizens are ready and willing to bring up more then double the number required by public authority, the only system we can justly pursue, is the volunteer one, this being the case, let us then carry out this pure republican system, and give scientific knowledge direct to the great mass of our noble youth, and it will be then that we can safely depend that the safe-keeeping of our noble institutions will be deposited in the hands of intelligent American pure republican minds, capable of self government by intelligence.

But we must recollect that to be able to do, and to be willing to do, are two different things, intelligence without virtue, namely a true sense of moral duty, is a very dangerous thing, it is a two edged sword sometimes very destructive, we must then take in consideration, intelligence, the attainment of scientific knowledge and the practice of the same we must look to the male part of the community; to secure social virtue, we must be very attentive to the female part! From the male part we attain the means how to do it, and from the female the will to do it, because we must bear in mind that the impression our mind receives of anything socially right or wrong, to do, or not to do, is more produced by our relation and connexion with the female then with the male. It is so from our infancy until old age.

The first stage of society: "Mother and Child." It is our association with our mother which impress on our mind the idea of right or wrong in relation to the association to her, to do or not to do. The next is a sister, brothers, as many as we may have, do not prompt or restrain our mind so much as one sister, it is the approving smile of a good sister which prompts us in our action, and the slightest frown of hers which restrains us.

At the age of manhood, it is his intelligent virtuous wife who prompts or restrains his actions. He cheerily toils the whole day, and the very sweat of his brow gives him new vigor and strength to new exertion, feeling as he does that one sweet smile of his chaste, intelligent wife will more then reward him for all his toil and trouble.

In advanced age, as a father, he may have many sons, who will naturally cause him to reflect seriously; but all of them together will not impress on his mind so deeply

the necessity of moral duty than one darling child as a daughter, and the more she advances to the age of womanhood, the more he feels keenly how indispensable moral duty is for our own welfare and happiness. It is so in domestic private life, but by far more so we perceive it in social public life as a nation.

To convince ourselves of the truth of it, we have only to try to ascertain the principle of social organization of any nation as moral agents, and we will soon find that we cannot come to any conclusion by investigating the male part; we can only decide it by the moral state of the female part.

For instance, we may find a nation socially organized as a body, apparently possessing moral strength by the principle of its organization, and still, if you examine them closely you will find that they are totally immoral and barbarous.

We may find a nation who have erected the most splendid buildings, constructed public works on the grandest scale for public utility, and still the means adopted by the party in power who ordered it, have been the most unjust and immoral toward those who performed the work.

We may also find a nation far advanced in the fine arts, but if you examine the motive and intention of the design, you will find to your regret, that the noblest genius have been prostituted to pamper the corrupted taste of the profligate and most abandoned.

We may find a nation who apparently has arrived to a high degree of perfection in all the noble sciences, including the science of law for the good government of society, but if you investigate it, you will find that the great mass had no benefit of it; and even the just application of law was confined to a mere few: the great mass have been outlawed by Law.

But so soon as we find the female part morally correct, we can rest assured that the principle of their social organization is a correct one, securing as we see it does the social source of moral duty, namely female moral purity.

And hence we see the ancient Jews as a strictly moral people, have been very attentive to this truly most important social affair, and two days in the year, one of them the solemn national day of Atonement, they seriously took it into consideration, and the very first step was, to take particular care of the daughter of the poor that

she should not be put to the blush, because her father is unfortunately poor. Their action the whole year in regard to it was in accordance with it. See tract, תענית last section, which speaks volumes.

We must take particular notice of the national song, addressed by the female part to the male, concluding with the two last verses of Prov., "Favour is deceitful and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised, give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates."

And we must take in consideration that the author of the book, as a moral instructor on the general principle of moral duty without any allusion to forms and ceremonies, after giving his views on different subjects in regard to the different stations we occupy as social beings. He draws up the sum total of his book in the last chapter, commencing with his Allegorical character named Lemuel Melech; the signification of the words applicable to the object in view, and in this form, the author explains to us his motive and true intention of the book altogether, and any one who comprehends the original Hebrew will know how to do justice to its real merit.

The scene, the real picture of life presented by the author to our minds eye, is this: an aged intelligent and virtuous matron addressing her only darling child, her son, who has arrived to the age of manhood, ready to take his station in society as a moral agent, communing together as mother and child, mother-like she takes her dear son in her arms and presses the dear object of all her motherly affections to her sincerely loving motherly heart, and emphatically exclaims: "Oh my dear beloved son! Before we part, listen to the voice of your sincerely loving mother!" She gives utterance to her natural motherly feelings. Lifting up her eyes to the noble countenance of her manly son in her arms, she proceeds with all the endearing expressions peculiar to the mother, because it is the mother who peculiarly feels it: "What my son, and what the son of my womb, and what the son of my vows! what is it, that I as your loving mother wish to impress on your mind my dear son is: give not thy strength &c.;" concluding with the twenty-two last verses as a poem, arranged in the original Hebrew alphabetically, to give facility to our memory, to retain that social virtue is indispensable for social welfare and happiness, and any one who is acquainted with the peculiar strain of

the Hebrew language will find that the conclusion of the book of Proverbs, is one of the greatest master pieces of Antiquity, not of mere stone and mortar, but as a noble production of a powerful, pure, moral mind, bold in its design and masterly finished, using the natural principle of social organization for social preservation.

We see now, kind reader, what we are in need of, and we must adopt means accordingly. We are in need of proper establishments for the cultivation of the mind of youth, from the time they leave the Public Schools until they are of age, to enable them to govern themselves by intelligence; for this purpose we have to apply to our public authorities to provide by law for it. For a prompting of the mind to a sense of moral duty by a natural feeling of social virtue, we must at first secure female virtue, which is the source and foundation of social virtue; but here, we cannot apply to public authority to provide by law, because law is only in extreme cases, and surely it is unfortunate enough for a female to apply to law, where the remedy is sometimes worse than the calamity. Here we must appeal to the intelligent public itself, and public authority can afterwards enact laws to carry out the just public will.

We must ask ourselves, is the poor man's daughter, whose parents cannot provide her with the means to commence house-keeping with, and which embraces many of our hardworking fellow-citizens, is the poor man's daughter, we must ask ourselves, actually protected by us in our midst? what is her protection? the *law?* Are we as moral beings not to blush at such an assertion? We must also consider, that early attachments between young folks are sooner formed among the hardworking masses than among the rich. The former living close together within a small compass, the impression of first love operates more powerfully on the mind of the child of the poor man than of the rich, because knowing that she has nothing to expect from her parents, all her future hopes and prospects are confined to the man of her own selection. The young man has learned some trade, and is able and willing to work and provide for himself and his fair friend: he truly respects and sincerely loves her, and would be most happy to take her as his wife, but is afraid to pop the question, because neither of them have the means to commence house-keeping, and therein you will find the true source of social evil so disastrous to the

daughter of the hardworking and honest, but poor man. Many a brave man goes down broken hearted, with his grey hairs in sorrow to his grave, because his darling child, his daughter, is unhappy, and many a noble hearted brother is browbeat, because of the unfortunate situation of his dear sister. This is a most serious social concern, which every moral mind ought to reflect upon. I do not consider it necessary, nor proper to expose, how all moral evils originate from it; still one thing I beg leave to observe, that all females are originally pure and virtuous, and society for its own sake is bound to take care of them. As moral beings we are bound to reflect, that it is nature and nature's God, who in his wisdom and goodness created us male and female for his wise ends, and it must be our solemn duty to assist one another, to carry out the intention of an allwise and kind Providence.

And I am firmly of opinion, if public attention would be properly called to it, knowing as we do, that our fellow citizens are always ready and willing to carry out every thing just and noble, that they will adopt means accordingly. We see already, that our fellow citizens, by the noble impulse of their free will, have formed associations for benevolent purposes; have we any reason to doubt that they will also associate for this grand social object? For my own part I cannot permit my mind to doubt it, and firmly believe that the very attempt of forming such associations will instantaneously have a beneficial effect on the public mind. The innocent daughter of the poor man, knowing that society is naturally her friend, certain speculators will be restrained from making wrong proposals, because the young female will feel independent, and this will be the best means to promote true temperance, restraining wrong inclinations, and preventing acts of violence. *Here* is the *source* and *here* we must apply the *remedy!*

Those, kind reader, are actually my honest thoughts, and as such I most respectfully submit it to your consideration. But do not credit me with it, I merely repeat what my own ancient Jews said about it, and acted accordingly.

And though on a distant shore in ages past, the waves of time have since rolled over Nations and Empires, still ideas conceived and words uttered by intelligent virtuous beings, are among the living.

I beg leave to call your attention again, that the scribbling of L. C. N. did appear at the time of the highest political excitement on the 11th of October last, and appeared in a paper which was the political organ of the open bible and cold water company. Without impeaching the intention of the editors, still the political party who is using the paper as its organ is responsible for its political designs, and the appearance of the scribbling with the circumstances and person connected, justifies the supposition that it was intended by the party to serve its political design, and shows that convert-hunters confederated and combined with foreign agents, are meddling with our republican political questions, to serve a foreign political purpose, as in truth, the convert-hunting concern altogether is not an american production, but smuggled in by foreign agents who have their factories here, and receive orders from their masters abroad, how to transact their business here. This explains why the same political party here is constantly hammering against our Catholic fellow-citizens, plainly because their master abroad has ordered them to do so.

The question is, whether any reflecting American citizen can countenance such proceedings; particularly under the present circumstances in regard to our foreign relations. We have on our continent Central America. We feel the necessity of being on true friendly relations and plainly speaking, even annexation with them. The inhabitants there are Catholics! Can we reasonably suppose that this vulgar proceedings against Catholics here, will be of such great service to it? And by whom is it instigated? Trace it to its source, and you will find, that it is foreign agency.

Next we see a strong current of emigration from China, who are neither Jews nor Christians, they are a very useful and peaceable people; their naturalization will be opposed by convert-hunters. The question for the reflecting American citizen is, whether it is politically right and morally just to admit the objections of the convert-hunter. We have a little further, the great empire of Japan. We as a great commercial people feel the necessity of being on friendly terms with all nations, what prevents us from having true friendly relations with Japan? It is their natural repugnance to the busy body of convert-hunters.

But more seriously must we direct our attention to old Europe itself what is going on there now? I think

it requires no explanation. I appeal to you whether it is prudent to permit any religious contentions amongst us. Are we not liable by the influence of it, to be unnecessarily entangled in foreign quarrels? One thing I beg leave to observe in reference to those foreign emissaries who came here to christianize the Jews in our United States.

The Jews of the United States know quite well enough what the political intention of Christianizing means, and understand the political meaning of a Christianized Jew to be Bishop of Jerusalem for political purposes of another party.

Now under the present circumstances there, is the ultimate point of contention actually where it is *now*, or is it not the Isthmus of Suez, near the old home of the Jews? Now supposing those politicians who have been trying to use the Jewish nationality with Christian trimming, seeing it will not do, will try it now without trimming, the question then will be, what form of government will those politicians try to introduce there. To be sure monarchical!

The question then will be for the citizens of the United States who, as a truly great commercial people are greatly concerned how this business should be settled, and who should be the manager. In plain words can the citizens of the United States permit monarchy to be introduced there? Just try, kind reader, to reflect on it, and I am sure that you will soon find out the enormity of it.

As for the Jews as a class of American Citizens, it is quite sufficient for them to know that Brother Jonathan is actually a brother: and they repose full confidence in the American Statesman that he will act accordingly, and the Jew will act as in duty bound as a citizen of the United States.

Let us then as fellow-citizens, jointly make it our serious study to be a worthy light to nations, and a just guide to the children of men to promote their welfare and happiness by the promotion of true intelligence and pure virtue. Which are the true sentiments of

Most Respectfully,

Your fellow-citizen of the Hebrew Confession,

JOSEPH SIMPSON.

Baltimore, יט׳ כסליו תנו לה מפרי ידיה

Corresponding *December* 20*th*, 1853.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Feb. 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 013 783 642 7